DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 637 CS 011 135

AUTHOR Bean, Rita M.; And Others
TITLE What Makes Chapter I Special: Perceptions of Reading Specialists, Classroom Teachers, and Principals.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (42nd, San Antonio, TX, December 2-5, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Compensatory Education; Elementary Education; Principals; *Program Effectiveness; Reading Consultants; Reading Teachers; Remedial Programs; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Educational Issues; *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Focus Groups Approach; Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

A study obtained information from classroom teachers, principals, and reading specialists about what they believed was important in creating effective Chapter 1 programs. One-day meetings were held in three different parts of Pennsylvania during which each group of educators (who were recommended by an advisory board) were interviewed using focus group techniques. All focus group interviews were audio taped and observers also took notes. Results indicated that: (1) the thoughtful and insightful critiques and solutions generated by the participants can be useful for the specific schools from which the participants came and as a source of possible ideas for other schools; (2) school personnel were not necessarily concerned about changes in the program, but were more concerned with how they could implement the changes effectively; (3) the advantages or strengths of Chapter 1 programs focused on indicators that could not be measured easily by standardized tests (such as self-esteem, advocacy role, and parent involvement); and (4) the focus group technique proved to be an effective means of obtaining the best thinking of professionals involved in and concerned about Chapter 1 programs. (A figure presenting bridges and barriers relative to Chapter 1 program settings and one table of demographic data are included. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352637

WHAT MAKES CHAPTER I SPECIAL: PERCEPTIONS OF READING SPECIALISTS, CLASSROOM TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS

Rita M. Bean, Charlene Trovato
University of Pittsburgh

Rebecca Hamilton
Pittsburgh Public Schools

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rita M. Bean
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the National Reading Conference. San Antonio, Texas December 1992.

CS011135

Research for this paper was supported by a grant from the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What Makes Chapter I Special: Perceptions of Reading Specialists, Classroom Teachers, and Principals

During the past 25 years, Chapter I has served millions of America's school-aged disadvantaged students by providing compensatory instruction in reading and math. It remains the largest fiscal investment of the federal government in elementary and secondary education and reaches almost every school district in the country (Dougherty, 1985). Chapter I programs have been the object of an increasing number of investigations over the past several years by researchers interested in studying the effects of these programs on student achievement. Unfortunately, these investigations have revealed some disappointing findings. The first of these is that though there are larger increases in Chapter I students' achievement than there are in comparable students not receiving Chapter I services, these increases are not substantial enough to raise Chapter I students to an achievement level of more advanced students (Slavin, 1987). Secondly, the gains of Chapter I students do not persist over time, and frequently Chapter I students tend to get caught in a revolving door phenomenon of leaving and returning to compensatory programs again and again (Kennedy, Birman & Demaline, 1986).

Despite these findings, the fact remains that Chapter I has served as an important symbol of federal support to education by providing services for thousands of students. From its beginning as Title I in 1965 to the present day, changes have been made to increase its effectiveness and reduce potential waste and abuse. Decisions in policy have been made in order to provide some room for local discretion while at the same time ensuring that federal funds are used appropriately. Nevertheless, decisions for change made at national, state, and even at district levels have not always been known or understood by professionals

in the field directly responsible for developing, implementing, or maintaining Chapter I programs. Nor have the views of these professionals about what constitutes effective Chapter I programs and what approaches toward program operations have proven successful been frequently sought.

Recent research, however, has moved forward to investigate the views and practices of reading specialists and classroom teachers directly involved in Chapter I programs. In one study, for example, teams of educators involved in Chapter I were asked about their Chapter I program (Bean, Fotta, & McDonald, 1991). Although most programs were pullout in nature, there was great diversity in the descriptions of instructional practice. Respondents were generally positive about the quality of the Chapter I programs in their schools, but they did express some important concerns. These revolved around the difficulty of scheduling and the time needed to collaborate and communicate if there was to be congruence between classroom and remedial programs.

In a second study (Wilken, 1992), the views of Chapter I teachers were solicited via a questionnaire, follow-up telephone interviews, and four site visits. Once again, Chapter I reading teachers were generally positive about their programs. However, Wilken (1992) did indicate that a number of concerns raised by others were reinforced in her findings as well. These included concerns about the large number of boys in Chapter I reading programs, nonexistent or partial coordination and collaboration, lack of parent involvement, lack of independent reading, and response that generally Chapter I students did not leave the program able to compete in regular classrooms.

Our goal in this study was to obtain information from three sources--classroom teachers, principals, and reading specialists--about what they believed was important in creating effective Chapter I programs and how they resolved

issues such as the ones identified above. We believed that information from such groups could provide us with important knowledge not only about the variables that contribute to effective program development, but strategies for attaining various goals.

Methods

In this study, we used the focus group interview as our technique for data collection. The focus group technique, which has been used widely in market research, is being used more frequently by researchers interested in educational issues (Krueger, 1988; Lederman, 1990). Focus groups are indepth group interviews in which a purposive, although not necessarily representative, sampling of a specific population is brought together and their thoughts, feelings and behaviors about a particular issue are explored. The focus group technique rests on several assumptions that were critical to our study: (1) the group context creates freedom for its members to express ideas in an open and frank manner; (2) people are a valuable source of information; and, (3) people can report on and about themselves, especially if given help in "mining" that information by an interviewer (Lederman, 1990). The group interviews also enabled us to obtain more data from a larger number of individuals in a shorter period of time than we could obtain from individual interviews. Moreover, we were interested in the interactive data gathered through these group situations.

Several agencies, including the Division of Federal Programs, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Keystone State Reading Association, Association of Federal Program Coordinators, and PA Association of Elementary School Principals worked together to undertake this project. An advisory group of 13 members, representing these organizations, was appointed to assist in the development of this project by generating issues to be discussed and making recommendations of

participants for the focus group interviews. Groups of reading specialists, classroom teachers, and principals from across the state of Pennsylvania were invited to participate in focus group interviews that would give them an opportunity to discuss their own Chapter I program, their sense of its effectiveness, its strengths and problems. We held one-day meetings in the Eastern, Western, and Central parts of the state over a four week period. At each of these three meetings, we held three separate focus group interviews, two and a half-hours long, with a group of classroom teachers, reading specialists, and principals. In attendance at each interview session were approximately 8-10 participants. As mentioned above, participants were recommended by the advisory committee, with care taken to include representation from small and large districts, rural and urban districts, both genders, and minority participants. A description of our participants appears in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Prior to the interview sessions and with our advisory committee, we developed a question guide that addressed three major topics: descriptions of individual Chapter I programs (their strengths and problems); provisions made for collaboration; and general perceptions and attitudes about Chapter I programs. Training of interviewers and observers was a two-step process. First, we held sessions with an external consultant, an expert in focus group marketing research whose focus was on helping us develop an understanding of group process and discussion techniques. We also held a meeting of the advisory team, in which we conducted a simulation of a focus group. The session, which was videotaped, was critiqued by our external consultant who made recommendations as to how we could

improve both the flow and sequence of our questions and our use of group process/interviewing techniques.

An interviewer was assigned to each of the three groups--teachers, principals, and reading specialists, and served as interviewer for all sessions with that particular role-group. All three interviewers who had gone through the training were experienced educators, had been classroom teachers, and had held supervisory experiences in schools.

Managing the Data.

All focus group interviews were audio taped and observers also took notes, focusing on the attitudinal behaviors which would support or clarify various responses. Tape recorded data were transcribed and then converted for use with Ethnograph (Seidel, 1988). In order to identify various response patterns, we first used our questionnaire as the basis for predetermining possible categories which would be found in the text, although we also used the data as the basis of formulating additional categories. The initial code book that was developed by the research team was then used by two graduate student researchers who read the texts and coded the major trends and patterns. The research team then met to discuss the coding and patterns that were identified. After this first analysis, refinement and further development of the codes occurred based on discussions of the research team. Response patterns were noted and compared across regions and across constituent groups.

After the initial coding of the data, 15% of the coded pages were recoded by one of the student researchers to determine intercoder reliability. There was 95% agreement between the two raters.

Findings

There were few differences in perspectives among the three groups of

educators. Each group, however, provided important contributions about Chapter I reading programs from their own points of view. From the data, we organized our findings into three distinct topics: creating and maintaining effective programs; roles of professionals; strengths and problems of Chapter I. A summary of the views of participants about each of these issues is described below.

Creating and Maintaining Effective Programs.

Four themes were generated from the data as to creating and maintaining effective programs: need for flexibility, relationship between setting and effectiveness, staff development needs, and planning. All groups expressed the need for flexibility and localized control of programs. In other words, although there was an acknowledgement of federal, state, and district guidelines that needed to be met, participants felt that decisions about setting (pullout versus inclass), roles and responsibilities of the reading specialist and the classroom teacher (relative to Chapter I) needed to be made at the school level so that various factors such as size of school, number of students eligible for Chapter I, teacher/student ratio could be taken into consideration. The groups were emphatic about the advantages of models that provided for flexibility, e.g., took into consideration the special needs of children and the relationships between classroom teachers and specialists.

In discussing setting relative to effectiveness, the groups identified strengths as well as problems of all organizational plans for Chapter I, but stressed that the keys to the success of any of them were communication and collaboration between specialists and teachers. Figure 1 provides a summary of the advantages and disadvantages (what we called bridges and barriers) that participants described relative to Chapter I program settings.

All groups saw inclass settings as providing more opportunity for

collaboration, cooperation, and communication between classroom teachers and reading specialists, especially when there were good relationships between classroom teachers and reading specialists. As several specialists stated,

> The inclass plan works extremely well when you have a receptive person (teacher) who is interested in what you are doing and feels that together you can do something good.
>
> You can also share with them (classroom teacher) ideas that you have, ways that they can adapt or change what they are doing to help.
>
> When it works well it is the best!

All groups also saw a possible problem with inclass settings when the reading specialist served as what they labeled "an aide." As one specialist stated, "There are times ....specialists feel like a maid in the classroom...because of the physical setup of the room."

The major advantage of a pullout setting according to the groups was that it provided a special, secure environment for students where those who have failed could feel free to take risks and try new strategies. Pullout settings, in the views of these participants, seemed to be places where students could feel successful and develop more positive self-esteem. As one classroom teacher reported, "my students like going out to Chapter...because they get that individual attention by somebody who is building their self-esteem." This is certainly a different view from that of researchers such as Bickel, 1982;

Leinhardt & Palley, 1982; and Haynes & Jenkins, 1986, who have criticized Chapter I pullout programs because of the possible stigma for students.

A third theme generated from the data was the expressed need for staff development that would enable those involved in Chapter I programs to work more effectively as members of a team. Teachers as well as specialists expressed some concern about their lack of experience with the team teaching that is an implicit part of inclass settings. Classroom teachers especially lamented the fact that they did not get the opportunities that Chapter I teachers often had to learn about new ideas and trends in teaching reading. The groups were specific about the type of inservice that they would recommend if any change in programming were to occur: need for awareness on the part of all groups as to why a change was being suggested; involvement of classroom teachers in building the compensatory program; and sessions that would focus on how collaboration between specialist and classroom teacher could best occur. All groups stressed the need for careful planning that would assist the specialist and classroom teacher in deciding the details of any new program (who will do what, when, and how). All groups, but especially the principals, discussed the need to increase awareness and knowledge of Chapter I regulations and guidelines for school personnel. A number of principals and classroom teachers indicated that they were unfamiliar with substantive requirements of Chapter I programming.

The final theme relative to creating an effective Chapter I program dealt with the need for planning time for collaboration and communication. The groups were supportive of the need to coordinate efforts of the classroom teacher and specialist, but also adamant that coordination required scheduled time for this coordination. Groups discussed many different ways in which planning was handled at their schools, including scheduled planning time before or after school,

dismissing students early one afternoon a month, or hiring a substitute for classroom teachers for one-half day on a regular basis while the reading specialist met with each classroom teacher. There was also much discussion of situations in which scheduled planning was not provided, yet teachers "made" the time to make the program work by meeting on an informal basis during the day or after school.

Professional Roles.

One of our questions in the focus group interview was aimed at getting a picture of how each of the participant groups saw their roles and the roles of the other groups. In fact, there was little disagreement about what the responsibilities of each of the role-groups were. Reading specialists acknowledged the classroom teacher as the "primary" teacher of Chapter I students and they understood the importance of the classroom teacher assuming a major role in making decisions about the focus and content of the instruction provided in Chapter I sessions.

The reading specialists in all three groups, although positive about their roles in Chapter I, expressed some frustration and confusion about the effect of changing regulations and guidelines. They felt that new programs demanded new and different roles and competencies. They felt that too often there was a lack of clarity about how these different roles were to be handled. As one specialist stated, "Are we going to be a teacher and work with children,...a teacher of teachers...a consultant...developer of materials.?" Specialists also identified several important characteristics for reading specialists if they are to be effective:

> have to be open-minded....you have to be
> knowledgeable...have a sense of humor too..you have to

be the kind of person who will go out and work with other people.

I think tact is an important quality....also an eagerness to keep up with the trends.

You have to invest yourself as a staff member in the school.

Classroom teachers, on the other hand, generally viewed the reading specialists as valuable resources in assisting them in making decisions about how to plan instruction for Chapter I students. They also viewed reading specialists as leaders in the development of the whole school reading program. Yet, classroom teachers were also vocal about the fact that although they were not reading specialists, they were instead "kid" specialists. They felt that reading specialists needed to consider input they could give about students' behaviors and performance in the classroom. Some classroom teachers expressed the view that specialists conveyed the impression that they, the specialists, had the "answers" to students' reading problems and therefore, felt little need to solicit other professional views. Though this was not a consistent comment, it appeared to be a matter of concern for some classroom teachers.

Classroom teachers lamented the fact that they did not have the same opportunities as Chapter I teachers to attend various professional conferences or meetings that would enable them to become more familiar with current trends and ideas for teaching reading. This view was supported by reading specialists as well; as one expressed:

A lot of classroom teachers don't have the advantage of inservice that we do. We can attend conferences...keep ourselves up on the latest

techniques.

The principal was seen as an important member of the team who could provide support to classroom teachers and reading specialists. All agreed that principals must have some direct involvement in the decisions surrounding the organization of the Chapter I program. Further, once organizational decisions were made, principals should further assist in the development of instructional and planning schedules to enhance effective and efficient programs. Several groups also saw the principal as the arbitrator when difficulties arose between specialists and classroom teachers. As one principal stated, "I find myself in the role of marriage counselor."

Strengths and Problems.

Our groups identified five major strengths of Chapter I reading programs, with two of the most frequently mentioned strengths focusing on the affective potential of Chapter I in: (1) promoting self-esteem and self-confidence of low achieving readers, and (2) fostering a love of reading. As one reading specialist stated, "The pressure is off. They can relax when they are with you. They can be a person...it is very enjoyable." Classroom teachers also supported this view: "the thing that pleases me most is seeing the change in the self-esteem of the children."

Reading specialists described many different strategies for encouraging reading, from programs in which older Chapter I students read to primary classes to specialists who described the reading that they did in the classrooms of students. As one teacher described his Time Traveler program, "The kids would give up their lunchtime to practice; we'd show them how to hold the book, show pictures. They learn more and are interested in reading through that approach."

Another strength of Chapter I was the specialized instruction that was

planned for students. Groups identified many different approaches and strategies for working with students, with many examples focusing on students being actively involved in reading and writing. This is certainly not consistent with the findings of researchers such as Allington, Steutzel, Shake, and Lamarche (1985); Leinhardt & Pallay (1982) who have criticized the type of instruction found in compensatory programs.

Participants also discussed the fact that Chapter I personnel served as advocates for their students. Specialists described ways in which they worked with teachers to prevent them from penalizing students who cannot do the work, and ways in which they encouraged schools to include Chapter I students in special programs. One Chapter I specialist in describing an event in which her students visited a college for a Young Authors Day, said,

> At the end of the day we were so excited that they (the students) were able to fit in and they just felt it was terrific. They were not having any difficulty at all in reading with all those of those...gifted and above average children and they did beautifully.

Finally, the participants felt strongly that the emphasis on parent involvement was a real strength. Although they were frank about the difficulties of getting parents of Chapter I children involved, participants shared many different ideas about programs that worked. It appeared as though programs that included children helped to bring parents to the school. One specialist described a video that she produced of ideas to send home to working parents.

Although our participants were extremely positive about Chapter I reading programs, they also were not unaware of the problems that existed in Chapter I programs. These problems were categorized into three major themes: working

relationships, structure of the Chapter I program, and curricular concerns. Two of these themes, working relationships and program structure have been discussed previously as participants described ways in which to create and maintain effective programs. The third, curricular concerns, revolves around the dilemma created by the support for congruence between classroom and remedial instruction. Specifically, when districts have rigid regulations about what constitutes the curriculum at a specific grade level, participants felt it was difficult to meet the needs of low achieving students. Specifically, when classroom teachers must use the texts of a specific level, e.g., sixth grade, and the job of the reading specialist was to help the Chapter I students to manage that text, the needs of students reading at much lower levels may not be addressed. Rather, the focus would be given to "fitting" the student to the curriculum.

Conclusions

The results of this focus group study led us to four conclusions that are discussed in this section. First, the thoughtful and insightful critiques and solutions generated by our participants certainly can be useful not only for the specific schools from which these participants come, but as a source of possible ideas for other schools. The ability of these groups to analyze the issues related to Chapter I programs supports the current emphasis for teacher empowerment and decision making on issues of curriculum and instruction.

Second, our results indicate that school personnel are not necessarily concerned about changes in Chapter I programs, and in fact they understand the need for such changes. Rather, they are more concerned with how they can implement various changes effectively. They are adamant about being involved in the decision making process and having opportunities to discuss any problems that

might arise when program changes are made. Our findings indicate a great need for staff development programs that: (1) include all professionals involved in Chapter I programs, and (2) transcend curriculum and instructional issues. The need for sessions that focus on developing working relationships among staffs appears to be an imperative. Collaboration, an essential part of Chapter I programs, does not appear to be a natural occurrence--provision must be made to facilitate it.

Third, the advantages or strengths of Chapter I programs described by our participants focused on indicators that could not be measured easily by standardized tests (e.g., self-esteem, advocacy role, parent involvement). Yet much of the criticism of Chapter I has to do with its inability to improve significantly the reading performance of Chapter I students as measured by standardized tests. The dimensions of effectiveness as cited by our participants are much more difficult to measure, and most likely are seldom used as indicators of success. Perhaps the challenge to us is to consider ways in which we can include in our assessments of Chapter I programs alternative measures that would be accepted and valued by both the educational community and society as a whole.

Finally, the focus group technique proved to be an extremely effective means of obtaining the best thinking of professionals involved and concerned about Chapter I programs. Each of the groups echoed the comment that they were not often asked for their opinions about educational issues and how to improve programming for students. We found our groups to be quite serious about the task given them and willing to share both positive and negative aspects of their own Chapter I reading programs.

Implications

The results of this study could be used by school districts as a basis for

discussion of their own Chapter I programs. We suggest that each school site identify an advisory team whose members would provide input about Chapter I program structure and setting, discuss the roles of specialists and teachers in the program, address issues of instructional approaches and philosophies, and find ways to best deal with the problems of time management and scheduling. If a school currently has a governing council or an instructional support team, it might be expedient to include Chapter I as one of their responsibilities.

The importance of staff development, especially for districts contemplating any changes in their Chapter I programs, cannot be understated. Such staff development should include such topics as: background about Chapter I, school literacy goals, working relationships, and creative scheduling, as well as other topics suggested by participants.

The new roles which demand more teaming between classroom teachers and reading specialists speak to the need for university and colleges preparing professionals to include in their preparation programs experiences with teaming and collaboration. In summary, the findings of this study provide educators at various levels, from teachers in the classroom and school administrators to college personnel, with useful information about Chapter I reading programs, their current status, and potential for change.

Note: We wish to acknowledge the efforts of the leadership team: Richard Brickley, Director, Project RISE; Mimi Folk, Hampton Schools; Dick Force, PA Association Federal Program Coordinators; Judy Gehman, East Lancaster County Schools; Al Giuliano, PA Association Elementary Principals; Gail Jackson, Coatesville Schools, Mary Ann Mackey, Pittsburgh Public Schools; Glenna McIntyre, East Franklin Schools; Greg Morris, Pittsburgh Public Schools; Ross Scarantino,

Pittston City Schools; James Sheffer, Chief, PA Division of Federal Programs; Judy Stopper, Marple Newtown Schools; Dora Tartar, Pleasant Valley Schools. Our appreciation also to our graduate students, Linda Zimmerman, who served as one of the moderators, and Brenda Golembesky, Debbie Rice, and Joann Dugan who assisted with data analyses.

References

Allington, R., Steutzel, H., Skake, M. & Lamarche, S. (1985). What is remedial reading? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Colorado Council of the International Reading Association, Denver, CO.

Bean, R.M., Fotta, B., & McDonald, L. (1991). Survey of Chapter I Programs in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Educational Research Association, Harrisburg, PA.

Dougherty, J.C. (1985). Report on Changes under Chapter I of the Consolidation & Improvement Act (Serial No. 99-B), Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Haynes, M.C. & Jenkins, J.R. (1986, Summer). Reading instruction in special education resource rooms. American Educational Research Journal, 23 (2), 161-190.

Kennedy, M., Birman, B.F., & Demaline R.E. (1986). The effectiveness of Chapter I services. Second Interim Report for the National Assessment of Chapter I, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. United States Department of Education.

Krueger, R.A. (1988). Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research. London: Sage Publications.

Leinhardt, G. & Bickel, W. (1987). Instruction's the thing wherein to catch the mind that falls behind. Educational Psychologist, 22(2), 177-207.

Leinhardt, G. & Pallay, A. (1982). Restrictive educational settings: Exile or haven? Review of Education Research, 52 (4), 557-578.

Lederman, L.C. (1990, April). Assessing Educational effectiveness: The focus group interview as a technique for data collection. Communication Education, (38), 117-127.

Seidel, J. (1988). The Ethnograph: A User's Guide Version 3 (computer program). Qualis Research Associates.

Slavin, R.E. (1987, October). Making Chapter I make a difference. Phi Delta Kappan, 69 (2), 110-119.

Wilken, P. A. (1992). Teachers' Views of Chapter I Programs. University of Illinois: Center for the Study of Reading.

Table 1. Demographic Information

	Reading Specialist	Classroom Teacher	Principals
Total Number	25	25	27
Gender			
Male	6	5	11
Female	19	20	16
Minority	1	1	5
Experience (years)			
1-5	0	1	0
6-10	2	7	0
11-15	10	4	4
15 +	13	12	23
Had Experience with Focus Group	1	0	1

Figure 1. Instructional Setting: Identification of Bridges and Barriers

		Principals	Reading Specialists	Classroom Teachers
BRIDGES	**Inclass**	• *Provides more opportunities for collaboration, cooperation and communication.* • Provides less isolation for students.	• *Provides more opportunities for collaboration, cooperation and communication.* • Could serve more students	• *Provides more opportunities for collaboration, cooperation and communication.* • Provides congruence. • Discourages the labelling of children.
	Pullout	• *Provides students with a place and opportunities to feel special.* • Serves more students.	• *Provides a special environment for young students.* • Requires collaboration and cooperation to be successful. • Provides positive learning experiences in small groups.	• *Provides a comfortable environment for students to try new strategies.* • Provides opportunities for students to develop positive self-esteem and self-confidence. • Provides special/individualized attention for students.
	Combin.	• *Provides the flexibility to do what is best for the students.*	• *Provides flexibility of setting when student's needs are better met outside of the classroom.* • Provides flexibility for personality and philosophical differences between specialist and teacher.	• *Provides flexibility to change settings when necessary* "MIRRORS THE NEED OF THE PEOPLE AND CHILDREN INVOLVED"
BARRIERS	**Inclass**	• *When a reading specialist acts in the role of an aide.* • Permits reading specialist to work with Chapter 1 students only.	• *When a reading specialist acts in the role of an aide or an observer.* • Increases the distractibility of students. • Collaboration, cooperation and communication are difficult. • Provides little flexibility for personality and philosophical differences between specialists and teacher.	• *When a reading specialist acts in the role of an aide.* • Team teaching is difficult. • Encourages a pullout model within the classroom. • Improper scheduling provides no time for cooperative planning.
	Pullout	• Reading specialist's room can be an undesirable facility. • Could serve fewer students.	• Teacher penalizes student for going to Chapter -- such as making up work during recess.	• Resentment on the part of the student for being pulled out -- they miss alot of classwork. • Does not fit whole language approach. • Improper scheduling provides no time for cooperative planning. • Promotes labelling of students.
	Combin.	• none expressed	• none expressed	• none expressed

**Text in italics indicates trends across groups